APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,710	08/31/2001	Il Gun Kwon	0465-0854P	8869

2292   7590   07/27/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
TRAN, TRANG U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/942,710	KWON, IL GUN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Trang U. Tran	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 May 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re pages 9-15, applicant argues that neither Young nor Wachter discloses (1) "a controller that...produces a code conversion control signal" or (2) "a memory storing code conversion data" or (3) "a code converter converting the code into a code corresponding to the verified peripheral media device using the code conversion data stored in the memory by responding to the code conversion control signal", or (4) "the code converted outputting the converted code to the verified peripheral device through the communication port by responding to the output control signal" , the Office Action has not provided proper motivation to modify Young in view of Wachter because Young works well without the need to incorporate a communication port to be connected with the peripheral media devices through a communication line and does not generate any converted code to be outputted to a media peripheral device though the communication port while Wachter's communication port is connected to a CPU which generates different signals to activate a plurality of RCEDs, whereas Young has only one remote 100 and has no need to use a CPU to activate his one remote 100.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Young et al discloses in col. 5, lines 25-32 that

"The input-select-table generally corresponds to the ID set up for the current active mode. A device typically has an ID code for its particular type, make, and mode. Loading the ID code provides the remote with information to control that particular device. The ID code may correspond to a database having only the "available functions" to be controlled, or the exact signal parameters which must be sent to effectuate a proper response in the device."

From the above passage, it is clear that the claimed "code conversion data" is anticipated by Young et al's database, which is used to convert input code into a code corresponding to a specific peripheral media device. Thus, the alleged claimed (1) "a controller that...produces a code conversion control signal" or (2) "a memory storing code conversion data" or (3) "a code converter converting the code into a code corresponding to the verified peripheral media device using the code conversion data stored in the memory by responding to the code conversion control signal", or (4) "the code converted outputting the converted code to the verified peripheral device through the communication port by responding to the output control signal" is disclosed in col. 5, lines 25-32 of Young.

The examiner has pointed out what each of the prior art references teaches and has indicated how and why these references would have been combined to arrive at the claimed invention and applicant cannot show non-obviousness by attacking the references individually where, as here, the rejection is based on a combination of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Wachter teaches that his invention has plurality advantages from col. 2, line 15 to col. 3, line 37. One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to combine the references as proposed by the examiner for the

above advantages of Wachter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Young et al. (US Patent No. 6,567,011 B1) in view of Wachter (US Patent

No. 6,469,633 B1).

In considering claim 1, Young et al discloses all the claimed subject

matter, note 1) the claimed a remote controller producing a remote code for

controlling for its own use, a remote code for controlling peripheral media

devices, and selection signals of external input sources in accordance with a

user's selection is met by the remote control 1 (Figs. 1-4, col. 4, lines 24-56), 2)

the claimed a receiver part receiving one of the remote codes from the remote

controller is met by the receiver 20 (Fig. 1, col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 56), 3) the

claimed a controller verifying that a present external input source corresponds to

one of the peripheral media devices and produces a code conversion control

signal and an output control signal is met by the receiver device 20 which

configured to receive a selected input signal wherein the selected input signal

from one of the input devices 30 and 40 (Fig. 1, col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 21),

4) the claimed memory storing code conversion data is met by the input-select-table which is loading the ID code provides the remote with information to control that particular device (Figs. 1 and 5, col. 5, line 25 to col. 8, line 8), and 5) the claimed code converter converting the code into a code corresponding to the verified peripheral media device using the code conversion data stored in the memory by responding to the code conversion control signal, the code converter outputting the converted code to the verified peripheral media device through the communication port by responding to the output control signal is met by the remote control 100 which is outputting the ID code verification state (col. 9, lines 3-40).

However, Young et al explicitly do not disclose the claimed a communication port to be connected with the peripheral media devices through a communication line.

Wachter teaches that the CPU 2 is coupled via serial cable 6 from the serial port of the CPU2 and the input of IR transceiver 7, the IR transceiver 7 had, in the prototype, 4 dual IR emitters, but in general must be capable of controlling a suitable number of IR emitters 8 selected according to the design of the overall system, and coupled to RCEs via IR cable 9 (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 53-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the serial port as taught by Wachter into Young et al's system in order to provide a control system for controlling multiple electronic components via a single user-operated remote control device.

In considering claim 2, the claimed wherein the media device and pheripheral media devices include TV receiver, DVD, video-cassette recorder, and a set-top box is met by the media system 10 (Figs. 1 and 8, col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 23 and col. 6, lines 5-22) of Young et al.

In considering claim 3, the claimed wherein the communication port is one of an RS232C, an 12C, and a parallel port is met by col. 6, lines 49-63 of Wachter.

In considering claim 4, the claimed wherein the media device further comprises a display part displaying a menu of the media device, a menu of the verified peripheral media device, and an operation status of the controller by responding to the code of the remote controller is met by the graphical user interface (Figs. 5-9, col. 5, line 38 to col. 7, line 34) of Wachter.

In considering claim 5, the claimed wherein the remote controller includes keys for selecting the external input sources corresponding to the peripheral media devices enabling the peripheral media devices to be connected to the media device is met by the remote control 1 (Figs. 1-4, col. 4, lines 24-56) of Young et al.

In considering claim 6, the claimed wherein the peripheral media devices includes communication ports identical to the communication port so as to establish communication channels with the media device is met by the serial port of the CPU 2 (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 53-67 and col. 6, lines 49-63 of Wachter).

Claim 7 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

In considering claim 8, the claimed further comprising the step of displaying on a screen whether the media device and the peripheral media device corresponding to the present external input source mode are connected to each other is met by the graphical user interface (Figs. 5-9, col. 5, line 38 to col. 7, line 34) of Wachter.

In considering claim 9, the claimed further comprising the step of displaying character and video signals from the peripheral media device corresponding to the present external input source mode on a screen of the media device in accordance with the remote code is met by the graphical user interface (Figs. 5-9, col. 5, line 38 to col. 7, line 34) of Wachter.

In considering claim 10, the claimed further comprising the steps of: processing the code to operate the media device itself when the peripheral media device corresponding to the present external input source mode fails to be connected to the media device or the present external input source mode corresponds to the media device itself; and operating the media device in accordance with a command corresponding to the processed code is met by the customized default device ID code (col. 9, line 8 to col. 10, line 60) of Young et al.

In considering claim 11, the claimed wherein information of the code processed by the media device itself includes volume adjustment of the media device and change of the present external input source mode is met by the volume of the receiver 20 may be adjusted or the first means may also be used

to alter the system mode to other desired modes (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 35-56) of

Young et al.

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2.

In considering claim 13, the claimed further comprising the steps of:

executing a command corresponding to the converted code in the peripheral

media device corresponding to the present external input source mode is met by

the input-select-table which is loading the ID code provides the remote with

information to control that particular device (Figs. 1 and 5, col. 5, line 25 to col. 8,

line 8) of Young et al, 2) the claimed transferring an execution result from the

peripheral media device corresponding to the present external input source mode

to the media device is met by the remote control 100 which is outputting the ID

code verification state (col. 9, lines 3-40) of Young et al, and 3) the claimed

displaying an image according to the execution result on a screen and outputting

a voice according to the execution result through a speaker of the media device

is met by the graphical user interface (Figs. 5-9, col. 5, line 38 to col. 7, line 34)

of Wachter.

In considering claim 14, the claimed further comprising the step of

providing a communication channel set-on or set-off signal from the remote

controller to the media device by a user's selection so as to turn on or off a mode

for establishing communication channels between the media device and the

peripheral media devices is met by the graphical user interface (Figs. 5-9, col. 5,

line 38 to col. 7, line 34) of Wachter.

In considering claim 15, the claimed wherein the communication channel set-on signal is provided when the peripheral media devices have the same communication ports of the media device on an on-screen display menu of the media device from the remote controller by a user and wherein the communication channel set-off signal is provided when the peripheral media devices fail to have the same communication ports of the media device on an on-screen display menu of the media device from the remote controller by a user is met by the graphical user interface (Figs. 5-9, col. 5, line 38 to col. 7, line 34) of Wachter.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3.

In considering claim 17, Wachter discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed further comprising the steps of: monitoring whether a code to change the present external input source mode into a new external input source mode is produced from the remote controller is met by the user selects which task to perform by looking at the monitor 4 and manipulating a single remote control in one hand (Figs. 5-9, col. 5, line 38 to col. 7, line 34), and 2) the claimed relieving the established communication channel between the present external input source and the media device and establishing a new communication channel between the new external input source and the media device is met by the graphical user interface (Figs. 5-9, col. 5, line 38 to col. 7, line 34).

Conclusion

4.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is

(703) 305-0090. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM,

Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (703) 305-4795. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

TT _TT_
July 24, 2004

MICHAEL H. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER